



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

not necessarily follow that he thought no work was to be done outside of Israel and that other than Israelites would not enter the kingdom.

Jesus' attitude is seen best in his own activity, and in his conception of the gospel. He was personally interested in the welfare of non-Jews and by his emphasis on universalism he implicitly included them in the messianic salvation. They were among the crowds that heard him preach, they were included in the prophet's conception of Israel's mission and Jesus had actually worked on gentile soil. True, his activity was confined mostly to Jewish territory and his interest was mainly in his own people but his thought of God's favor for all men and his preaching about universal human brotherhood found a perfectly natural expression in his desire to bring both Jews and non-Jews to a knowledge of salvation. We are not to think that heathen missions as a theoretical problem, or the question of the Jews' rejection in favor of gentile converts, ever entered Jesus' mind. These questions were the distinctive product of the apostolic age. But in actual practice he sought the salvation of gentiles, and the very content of his message made it a missionary gospel.

This conclusion stands in sharp contrast with some current opinions on this subject. It rejects, on the one hand, the traditional idea that missions are grounded primarily in Jesus' direct command to his disciples after his resurrection, and, on the other, the position held by Harnack for example, that Jesus distinctly excluded the gentiles from his range of vision. If Spitta's contention is right, and it will not be easy to set aside the general conclusion which his thoroughly critical presentation of the material is made to establish, the missionary idea in Christianity is not merely a feature added by way of supplement; it expresses the very spirit of Jesus' own life and work.

SHIRLEY JACKSON CASE

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

TWO NEW WORKS ON THE FOURTH GOSPEL

Professor Bacon's work¹ in New Testament criticism reminds one more and more of Professor Cheyne's in Old Testament research; there is the same combination of literary scholarship with spiritual earnestness, the same faculty of imaginative power in dealing alike with the details of the text and with the broader constructions, or rather reconstruction, of the history, the same restless examination of tradition. The present volume

¹ *The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate*. A series of essays on problems concerning the origin and value of the anonymous writings attributed to the apostle John. By Benjamin Wisner Bacon, D.D., LL.D. New York: Moffatt, Yard & Co., 1910. xii + 544 pages. \$4.

is a fresh example of his indefatigable activity. It consists, in part, of articles contributed to American and British periodicals, which have been recast in order to form, with other essays, a coherent statement of the author's attitude toward modern criticism upon the Fourth Gospel. The conclusion which his paper conveys is that the gospel is not an apostolic first-hand witness to Jesus but a reinterpretation of Jesus in the light of Paulinism as that appeared to a later generation at Ephesus. The anonymous author or theologos was some elderly Hellenistic Jew with philosophic predilections like those of the Ephesian teacher to whom Justin Martyr was indebted. He was neither John the presbyter nor John the apostle. After him came one editor who added the last chapter to the gospel and recast the letter with the double object of identifying the beloved disciple and the son of Zebedee and of adjusting the Asiatic or Pauline tradition to the Petrine tradition of Syria and Rome. This editor was a contemporary of Papias and Justin, probably a Roman, who believed that John the apostle had written the Apocalypse in Patmos and therefore attributed to him the anonymous gospel as well. Since the subsequent tradition of the church was assisted by this erroneous idea of R, the redactor, it follows that the way to regain a right view of the gospel is to discard the letter with its claim of an apostolic and historical witness, and to take the original gospel as Theologos, its author, wrote it

Theologos, as we have called him, merges his own testimony completely in that of the church. The purest and loftiest Paulinism is reacting from the unbridled fancy of gnosticism toward the historic tradition of the church, but without the surrender of Pauline liberty in the spirit. Space does not here permit the demonstration how far below this level is that of the redactor, who, by his additions and readjustments, particularly in the appendix, has sought to harness this eagle to the wingless creatures of synoptic tradition (463).

Such is the main thesis of the book. In four parts, which occasionally overlap one another, the author presents it from various points of view, controversial and constructive.

The main conclusions of Part I ("The External Evidence," 17-154) are that the tradition of Irenaeus about the Asiatic apostles and elders is incorrect, and that John the apostle suffered early martyrdom at the hands of the Jews. The latter point is persuasively argued (127 f.), except that Professor Bacon has tried ingeniously but quite unconvincingly to connect the two witnesses of Rev. 12:1-13 with James and John, whom the apocalypticist is said to view as the Christian embodiment of Moses and Elijah in the original tradition. In Luke 9:51-56, "to the evangelist at least the spirit rebuked is not so much that of the historical Elijah

which it would not have occurred to any of our gospel writers to question; but (unless we greatly err) he sees rebuked in it the vindictive spirit of Rev. 11:1-13" (140-41). The parallel, I confess, seems forced, and the whole construction rather fanciful. The red martyrdom interpretation of Mark 10:39 is strong enough to stand without a buttress of this kind. Professor Bacon pays more attention to the Apocalypse than several recent writers on the Fourth Gospel have troubled to do; he rightly recognizes the significance of its evidence, instead of discussing it briefly like Canon Sanday and Dr. James Drummond. But in the chapter devoted to this problem, which opens Part II, he minimizes unduly the indorsement of the Apocalypse by Papias and Justin. Whether the indorsement was right or wrong, it is surely hypercritical to suggest that it need not have indorsed a belief in John's residence in Asia Minor or authorship (159). Professor Bacon's interest in maintaining this seems to be his disinclination to allow that John the presbyter² had any residence in Asia Minor. Since the only other John was martyred long before the date (Domitianic) of the Apocalypse, it follows that the latter is pseudonymous, chaps. 1-3 and 22:8-21 being added for the purpose of claiming the Palestinian prophecy (cf. chaps. 4-22:7) for the apostle. This literary fiction was "the true starting-point" (183) of the legend of the apostle John's residence in Asia Minor. Apart from other objections to this theory, the impossibility of detaching chaps. 1-3 from the original nucleus of the Apocalypse seems to one final. Besides, some definite starting-point is wanted for the Johannine tradition. The latter is more reasonably approached as the partial result of confusion between the two Johns than as a series of literary errors.

The appendix to the Fourth Gospel is dated at Rome *ca.* 150 A.D.; it claims the authorship for John, who is identified with the beloved disciple, and from this point the growth of the Johannine legend proceeds apace, through Irenaeus and the Muratorian Canon. "The assertions of Irenaeus and his contemporary supporters of the fourfold gospel simply reverberate with natural enlargements those which had previously been embodied by redactors and revisors in the substance of the instrumentum Johanneum" (268).

Part III ("On the Indirect Internal Evidence," 273-439) outlines a positive view of the gospel as a Pauline restatement of the evangelic tradition. The estimate of Paulinism as indifferent to the historic Jesus does not strike one as adequate, however; it is not easy to understand the author's connection between the "beloved disciple" and Gal. 2:20; and

² He will only allow a bare possibility that John the presbyter was the author of the Palestinian nucleus of the Apocalypse. But II and III John, as well as the Apocalypse, may well be his.

the discoverer of Paulinism in the Fourth Gospel as in Mark is pushed to almost uncritical extremes. The discussion of the topography and chronology (385 f.) is "far from denying all relation with Judaea and Perea to the entire unknown period of thirty or forty years before the beginning of the ministry" (410), but it might safely have yielded more to the agreement of Weizsäcker and Spitta; Spitta's predilection for Luke has always to be discounted, but Weizsäcker's *Untersuchungen* are of permanent value in this regard. The general view of the gospel outlined in the present volume as in the recent English works of Dr. Abbott, Dr. Forbes, Professor Scott, and Dr. James Drummond, seems likely before long to become the prevailing conception; one is all the more anxious therefore that it should be so stated as to do justice to the element of historical tradition which Zahn and Lepin, among others, have re-emphasized in the wake of Weizsäcker. The first and last chapters of Part IV serve to show how alive Professor Bacon is to the religious interests³ of the gospel; they sum up irenically the main conclusions which are defended at the point of the bayonet in the foregoing pages. Two chapters, sandwiched between them, are devoted to the literary analysis of the gospel, a province in which the author has already distinguished himself. The publication of Spitta's new volume is one of many signs which indicate that the last word is far from having been spoken on this matter.

The form of the book, which is partly composed of criticisms directed against contemporary scholars and partly occupied by independent discussions, does not make it altogether easy reading, and a brief notice like this does no manner of justice to the width of its range. If it had been compressed, it would have made a more definite impression; also, if it had been less clever, it might have been more convincing. Still, the tone of sincerity which characterizes its scholarship may win for it a hearing in circles when its views prove unacceptable. Certainly no student in any school will fail to find its pages teeming with suggestions and bristling with acute criticisms.

JAMES MOFFATT

BROUGHTY FERRY, SCOTLAND

Spitta's qualifications as a keen and subtle critic are well known. Few scholars have a more masterly command of the extra-canonical literature of the period and sphere of thought adjacent to the New Testament, from which to draw illuminating parallels. Few even of German scholars have

³ In his preface he recognizes that "the assailant of the traditional authorship of the Fourth Gospel has no real success unless he can obtain a hearing from men profoundly interested in the cause of revealed religion."

so keen a sense for subtle distinctions and shades of difference in thought, whereby to establish differences of origin in writings traditionally handed down as units. The former quality appears (along with a certain disposition toward the erratic and paradoxical apt to accompany genius, but not reassuring to the sober-minded) in our author's earlier championship of the authenticity of Second Peter at the expense of First Peter, and of the non-Christian origin of James. It appears to better advantage in his discussion of Hermas and his comparison of "the Testament of Job and the New Testament." His capacity for keen and subtle analysis of documents has been shown in earlier attempts to distinguish sources and redactional material in Revelation, Acts, and Romans.

Several of the writings just referred to are contained in the three-volume work, issued in separate parts at intervals since 1893, entitled *Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristenthums* (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht).

It was in the first issue of this publication, in 1893, that Spitta came forward as one of the first and boldest to assail the traditional unity of authorship of the Fourth Gospel, under the title *Unordnungen im Texte des Vierten Evangeliums*. He has a right, now, in his fuller treatment of the question,⁴ to complain that Schwartz and Wellhausen, who since 1907 have given the weight of their great authority to a hypothesis of supplementation, take no notice whatever of their predecessors in the field. It is even worse when the critical world acts as if the discovery had now been made for the first time that the Fourth Gospel is far from being the "seamless coat" which Tübingen critics declared it; whereas Spitta is able to enumerate no less than eighteen New Testament scholars besides himself who during the last half-century have been protesting with all their might against this doctrine, largely in independence of one another.⁵

The present work opens with a definite presentation of results in a translation of the gospel so arranged that the portion regarded by Spitta as the authentically Johannine *Grundschrift* stands at the head of the page; underneath, in smaller type, appears the rest, a second source of unknown origin, interspersed with the editorial additions and comments set in italic. The argument in support of this analysis occupies the remaining 466 pages of the book. This method has the advantage of perfect clearness and definiteness. For the author it has the disadvantage of throwing into strongest light that which to most readers will seem his

⁴ *Das Johannes-Evangelium als Quelle der Geschichte Jesu*. Von Friedrich Spitta. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1910. xlvii + 466 pages. M. 15.

⁵ Spitta, who includes the present writer in his list, might well have added Professors E. D. Burton of Chicago, and C. A. Briggs of New York, a total, himself included, of twenty-one.

weakest side, a preoccupation with his own working hypothesis so intense as scarcely to admit the possibility of any other interpretation of the phenomena. This is all the less likely to prove convincing because the form which Spitta's working hypotheses seem almost fatally foreordained to assume is of the A B C type. His analyses usually result as follows: (1) an earlier, presumably authentic, *Grundschrift*, A; (2) an inferior second source, B; (3) an "undistributed middle," C, assignable to the editor or redactor. Too many results of this kind tend to make the reader suspect that the success of Pentateuch analysis has turned the heads of the New Testament critics. A travesty is easily framed stating the matter about as follows: The problem consists in attaching the largest possible proportion of the unobjectionable material to A, and the objectionable to B, while A at least is allowed to show no acquaintance with B, and both appear to advance by fairly complete and logical sequence toward distinctive ideals. Nothing must go to C that can be made to fit in at any point of A or B; brief clauses found wholly intractable may be assigned to the editor. So stated the process bears a strong resemblance to ingenious self-delusion.

Anyone who attempts the process, like the ingenious caricaturist Carl Hessedamm, will find however (if his material be really a literary unit) that plausible results are not easy to obtain on these conditions. And Spitta's results are always plausible—so plausible that even the reader who rejects the reconstruction, yes, even the compilation theory as a whole, if truly unbiased and scientifically patient, will acknowledge that "there is something in it." In fact there is so much in it that the student of this most vital, and at the same time most intricate and complex problem of New Testament criticism, will be apt to advance at least to the theory of supplementation. He will be inexcusable if he fails to examine and carefully weigh the arguments of Spitta, one of the subtlest, most brilliant, most erratic of New Testament scholars. He will be amply repaid, even if unconvinced.

B. W. BACON

YALE DIVINITY SCHOOL
NEW HAVEN, CONN.

THE WORLD OF SPIRITS IN THE FAITH OF PAUL

The thought of primitive Christianity regarding angels, demons, and Satan was long for science if not an unexplored country, at least an unobserved one. The first great scientific investigation into Paul's thought concerning spirits was Everling's *Paulinische Angelologie und Dämonologie*, which appeared in 1888. He showed on the basis of apocryphal and